

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/694,986

Applicant(s)

NAGAI ET AL.

Examiner

DABORAH CHACKO DAVIS

Art Unit

1795

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ms. Diana Diberardino, Reg. No. 46,453.

(3) Mr. Ogihara, and Mr. Okamoto.

(2) Mr. John Hayden, Reg. No. 37,640.

(4) Daborah Chacko-Davis.

Date of Interview: 18 November 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: U. S. Patent No. 4,646,424 (Parks et al), U. S. Patent No. 6,009,888 (Ye et al), and U. S. Patent No. 5,252,427 (Bauer et al).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Daborah Chacko-Davis/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed that Parks does not teach an irradiation after etching and a stripping after the post irradiation step. Discussed that Ye does not teach a irradiation during the post etching irradiation step, but teaches a UV ablation step. Also discussed that Ye does not teach a stripping step as a subsequent step to the post-etching irradiation step, but teaches a simultaneous UV ablation/stripping via acid bath step. Discussed Bauer teaches a post-etching step as either of the following two instances i.e., a re-exposure of the unexposed resist pattern followed by a development or a stripping step without any re-exposures; therefore applicant's representative discussed that Bauer does not teach a irradiation and a subsequent stripping process as per claim 1, and not a irradiation of a resist residue resulting from a stripping process followed by a development as suggested in claim 2 .